

From: Stan Friedland
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1 01 PM
Subject: Fw Media ownership

----- Original Message -----

From: Stan Friedland
To: mpowell@fcc.gov
Sent: Saturday, May 03, 2003 1 02 PM
Subject: Media ownership

You have scheduled a vote next month on the extremely important issue of permitting even greater ownership of media by one entity. Yet, this issue has barely been publicized to the general public, and certainly not discussed with any degree of depth or width, considering its huge significance. Consequently, one is led to believe that this rush to vote, while the issue has been kept under wraps, is being intentionally done to fool or shortchange the American people, in order to deliver more of OUR airwaves into the hands of fewer & fewer monopolistic owners. Such an action would range from irresponsible to perhaps criminal! Surely, you all took an oath of office when you became a commissioner! That oath makes the public your number ONE clientele, and not vested interests! If you're serving their interests first, then not only are you violating your oath, you are betraying public trust in a very harmful way. Our democracy is based on pluralistic avenues for free expression. Clearly, an affirmative vote on this poorly conceived issue, will run totally counter to this important premise of our democracy.

I request most urgently of each Commissioner a reconsideration of this vote. I ask that it not be held, and if it is, that you vote NO on it! To do otherwise would be to clearly harm the public good and to make a terrible dent in one of our most basic democratic premises, the need for widespread forums of free speech!

Sincerely,
Stan Friedland
Syosset, N.Y.

From: val scott
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1 01 PM
Subject: ownership of the media and public airways

Dear Commissioner,

It is clearly vital to our democracy and American way of life that our citizens have daily access to a variety of views and diverse opinions. You are the stewards of this democratic right and your upcoming vote on the rules of media ownership is crucial. In view of this, your apparent rush to hold the vote without fully informing the public and gaining their input is unconscionable.

I hereby demand that you postpone the vote on media ownership rules until full public hearings can be held across the country and in the Congress.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Valorie Scott, Westfield, Massachusetts

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster Easier Bingo
<http://search.yahoo.com>

From: Wren Osborn
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:04 PM
Subject: Lack of public hearings regarding changes in ownership rules of media and opposition to more monopolization

Dear Commissioner Copps,

I saw your on NOW last night. I was sorry Moyers cut you off when you began to say something about "more importantly." He spent a lot of time with the author so I believe he could have devoted more time to your segment. I have told him so.

I am very concerned about the lack of diligence of the FCC in informing the American public about possible changes that will result in more monopolization of TV media and monopolization of all media in select markets. I have sent e-mails to the other commissioners.

I am letting you know I am against further monopolization of media markets. I am for reducing the monopolization we already have.

The airwaves belong to the people and should be used to promote democracy, not strangle it. Monopolization has many negative effects for democracy. It tends to limit controversy and the presentation of diversified views. Also, the bottom line becomes more important than journalistic standards.

Sincerely,

Wren Osborn (Mrs.)
1151 Pine Drive
El Cajon, CA 92020
wrenosborn@cox.net
619-440-4179

From: Membership Department
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1 16 PM
Subject: Media Ownership Review

Dear Chairman Powell,

I strongly urge you to delay the June 2nd decision on Media De-regulation. Allowing a few large corporations to concentrate their ownership of media outlets in this country will seriously erode the quality of news the public now receives. Ultimately, the quality of life in this country will suffer from the ignorance of an ill-informed public.

The fact that these proposed changes have been little reported is in itself upsetting, and your determination to rush these changes through without public debate is unsupportable. Your role is to protect the public interest, not that of major corporations.

Sincerely,

Mary Taylor
New York, NY

CC: Michael Copps

From: bill van alstyne
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1 17 PM
Subject: media monopoly

Dear Mr. Copps

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,



Mr. Bill VanAlstyne
Coxsack, New York 12051-1616

From: john fuller
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1 26 PM
Subject: Deregulation of the communications industry

Dear Mr Powell

I've read and heard of your apparent head-long rush to remove all restrictions upon ownership and operation of media companies from newspapers to ISPs and radio and TV stations. I am in complete agreement with Commissioner Copps on the need for widespread, deliberate public hearings on this issue. I am adamantly opposed to the wholesale removal of restrictions on ownership of various media outlets.

It really doesn't matter what you believe is appropriate, sir. What matters is that the airwaves belong to the American people. They very much deserve to understand the issues and to comment on the decision process prior to the FCC taking a vote. Voting in June without the benefit of full and open public hearings on this issue is absolutely at odds with the rights of the American public.

Sir, it is your responsibility to hear the people speak prior to forcing a decision as far reaching as this will be. Why do you insist on rushing this process and making the decision without the benefit of public hearings all over the country?

Television is a wasteland. Most pop-format radio stations play garbage. It is only in the refuge of Public Radio and Television that we can find intelligent, informative programming. Your apparent desire to allow unfettered consolidation within the media is unquestionably NOT in the public interest. Please take the time to fully air the issues with the country and to allow for Congressional hearings prior to forcing this far-reaching decision.

I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

John Fuller, Major, USAF Ret
Nashville, TN

CC: Michael Copps, Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Kathleen Abernathy

From: DMCLV@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:32 PM
Subject: stop the media juggernaut

Dear Commission members

The media/press in this country is based on principles that were written with forethought and wisdom way back in the 1930's. Its principles and values still endure today and do not need to be changed or augmented. The airwaves in America belong to the citizens of the United States and must serve the public interest. Keep it that way. The consolidation of corporate power does not serve the public interest, as alternative voices and differing points of view are squelched to appease the corporate pocket book. We must protect the free speech and individual opinions of the "little guy" and keep the "bottom line" mentality out of the press, Internet, and media. Separation of ownership and power insure that many voices are heard, instead of one massive "party line." As the media giant Barry Diller puts it:

"Today as the FCC is pondering, and pondering what to do - the great big beautiful tomorrow has dawned. The 500 plus channels that were going to turn the old, heavily regulated world upside down -- is a full blown reality.

And before we go with the urge and throw everything out, what has the wisdom of the current rules gotten us? Well, what it got us was a rather clearly unintended consequence - The unintended consequence of deregulation is that the government has inadvertently allowed to happen the exact opposite of what it intended to do.

The big bad truth that I don't think anyone really understands or gives enough importance to is that the big four networks have in fact reconstituted themselves into the oligopoly that the FCC originally set out to curb back in the 1960s.

Five corporations, with their broadcast and cable networks, are now on the verge of controlling the same number of households as the big three did 40 years ago. We didn't think that was such a healthy situation back then, but back then there was this real, scary regulation - they may have controlled 90% of what people saw, but they operated with a sense of public responsibility that simply doesn't exist for these vertically integrated giant media conglomerates, driven only to fit the next piece in their puzzle for world media dominance.

All right. So there's concentration? Why should we care?

We should care for the same three reasons that the FCC cares. If I may quote the current chairman: "The public interest is about promoting diversity, localism, and competition."

Are we going to get real diversity? The program departments of these businesses are now so far down the chain of life in these giant enterprises that it's a miracle that all shows on the air aren't about rejection. Conglomerates buy eyeballs. That's it - and they leverage - oh do they do that - they leverage their producing power to drive content - their distribution power - such as retransmission consent - to drive new services - and their promotional power to literally obliterate competitors.

The old systems of course had flaws - but there was a tight yoke between what went on the air and the ultimate boss - and it was good that that chain was yanked both ways, often to the public's great good fortune

No one knows what's the best system for creativity, but for sure it doesn't work great without the pride and passion of the boss on the line and engaged. Ten years ago, independents produced sixteen new series. Last year they produced just one.

It's difficult to sustain an industry on one show, and, in fact the independents are dying in droves. Many of the small and medium sized ones are either out of business or work for the larger organizations, so they are, by definition, no longer independent.

The second criterion is localism. How does that look? The canary in the coal mine here is radio. Oligopolies now control a majority of radio markets. Under the old rules the top two station owners had 115 stations between them, now they've got 1,400. In many major markets they control 80 percent of the listenership with programming that originates hundreds of miles away - a disk jockey in Cincinnati broadcasting to Atlanta ain't very local."

He should know

Sincerely,
David M. Chambers
7420 Oak Grove Ave
Las Vegas, NV 89117

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, GBOYRACER@aol.com, Kmkvegas@aol.com, LVINFERNO@aol.com, Ravenglassart@aol.com, Seeer@aol.com, melpohl@mac.com, Glsm1@aol.com, BONKLEY@aol.com

From: DMCLV@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:32 PM
Subject: stop the media juggernaut

Dear Commission members

The media/press in this country is based on principles that were written with forethought and wisdom way back in the 1930's. Its principles and values still endure today and do not need to be changed or augmented. The airwaves in America belong to the citizens of the United States and must serve the public interest. Keep it that way. The consolidation of corporate power does not serve the public interest, as alternative voices and differing points of view are squelched to appease the corporate pocket book. We must protect the free speech and individual opinions of the "little guy" and keep the "bottom line" mentality out of the press, Internet, and media. Separation of ownership and power insure that many voices are heard, instead of one massive "party line." As the media giant Barry Diller puts it:

"Today as the FCC is pondering, and pondering what to do - the great big beautiful tomorrow has dawned. The 500 plus channels that were going to turn the old, heavily regulated world upside down -- is a full blown reality.

And before we go with the urge and throw everything out, what has the wisdom of the current rules gotten us? Well, what it got us was a rather clearly unintended consequence - The unintended consequence of deregulation is that the government has inadvertently allowed to happen the exact opposite of what it intended to do.

The big bad truth that I don't think anyone really understands or gives enough importance to is that the big four networks have in fact reconstituted themselves into the oligopoly that the FCC originally set out to curb back in the 1960s.

Five corporations, with their broadcast and cable networks, are now on the verge of controlling the same number of households as the big three did 40 years ago. We didn't think that was such a healthy situation back then, but back then there was this real, scary regulation - they may have controlled 90% of what people saw, but they operated with a sense of public responsibility that simply doesn't exist for these vertically integrated giant media conglomerates, driven only to fit the next piece in their puzzle for world media dominance.

All right. So there's concentration? Why should we care?

We should care for the same three reasons that the FCC cares. If I may quote the current chairman: "The public interest is about promoting diversity, localism, and competition."

Are we going to get real diversity? The program departments of these businesses are now so far down the chain of life in these giant enterprises that it's a miracle that all shows on the air aren't about rejection. Conglomerates buy eyeballs. That's it - and they leverage - oh do they do that - they leverage their producing power to drive content - their distribution power - such as retransmission consent - to drive new services - and their promotional power to literally obliterate competitors.

The old systems of course had flaws - but there was a tight yoke between what went on the air and the ultimate boss - and it was good that that chain was yanked both ways, often to the public's great good fortune

No one knows what's the best system for creativity, but for sure it doesn't work great without the pride and passion of the boss on the line and engaged. Ten years ago, independents produced sixteen new series. Last year they produced just one.

It's difficult to sustain an industry on one show, and, in fact the independents are dying in droves. Many of the small and medium sized ones are either out of business or work for the larger organizations, so they are, by definition, no longer independent.

The second criterion is localism. How does that look? The canary in the coal mine here is radio. Oligopolies now control a majority of radio markets. Under the old rules the top two station owners had 115 stations between them, now they've got 1,400. In many major markets they control 80 percent of the listenership with programming that originates hundreds of miles away - a disk jockey in Cincinnati broadcasting to Atlanta ain't very local."

He should know

Sincerely,
David M. Chambers
7420 Oak Grove Ave
Las Vegas, NV 89117

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, GBOYRACER@aol.com, Kmkvegas@aol.com, LVINFERNO@aol.com, Ravenglassart@aol.com, Seeer@aol.com, melpohl@mac.com, Glsm1@aol.com, BONKLEY@aol.com

From: NanWalt
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:45 PM
Subject: vote

Dear Commissioner Abernathy

Please vote against further consolidation of our media. I remember how wonderful it was when we had many locally owned newspapers, radio and TV stations, and ideas and opinions were more freely discussed. What makes our nation strong, and stand out against those countries with controlled media, is real freedom of the press, not the token freedom we are fast approaching. Thank you very much. Sincerely, Nancy Dennett

From: Madella Dale
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 2:06 PM
Subject: media deregulation

Dear Mr. Copps,

I watched Bill Moyers last night and I wish to thank you for your appearance. I had heard about the push to deregulate media ownership some time ago and that it is even a possibility is distressing enough. But the fact that apparently most Americans are not even aware of it is downright scary. I am further concerned that many people, even if aware of it, would not understand the implications of this action and that it would pose a huge threat to what seems to me an increasingly precarious democracy in this country. I will contact my congressman. Thank you again.

Madella Dale
Great Falls, Montana

From: bcapas
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 2 12 PM
Subject: Media is fourth arm of Government

(1) President, (2) Senate, (3) House, and the (4) Independent Media

The media has historically been the watchdog of our government and society. An independent media is crucial to government. All you have to do is look at the Middle East stations where few people or government runs the media.

We are still a free country and one of the main reasons is getting a story competitively.

From: Brice Bernard
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 2 12 PM
Subject: Broadcast ownership rules

I beg of you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that are now in effect which give the american public the opportunity to read/or hear the various viewpoints on imptant matters

Our country recently has been , and is now, in the process of making the Iraq people free Please do not limit the american people only to the viewpoints of the media conglomerates

Thank you

Brice J

From: itzam
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 2 26 PM
Subject: selling us out again hey?

I vehemently oppose further de-regulation of fcc regrading relazing the rules that allows for a virtual monopoly of our air waves this is a fascist threat to our democracy the right to know/ to acquire information regarding any subject I choose to investigate, to view arguments pro and con to my point of view is my right under the bill of rights eventually the large corps, that now have purchased their way into our government want to finish the job off and sieze all information that is not favorable to their bottomline are you there to help them?
this is a real threat and I know you know this are you going to sell us all out including yourself?
thank you?

From: Fgubanc@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 2:30 PM
Subject: Vote on June 2nd

It is urgently important that the American public be informed of the decisions that will be made on June 2nd. The relaxing of the present regulations could create monopolies of media and create vacuums in the information that every citizen is entitled to. I oppose any relaxing of the present rules. I feel that we already have too many monopolies of media. Clear Channel Communications is a perfect example of this.

I am very disappointed that your Commission has not made the information more available to every individual in America as it will affect every person for years to come.

Any vote should be postponed until open and public hearings have been held in every major city.

Florence Gubanc
Oakton, VA

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: itzam
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 2:34 PM
Subject: where do you stand?

I vehemently oppose further de-regulation of ownership over our airways
further de-regulation is a threat to our democracy but the suppression
of information on one hand and propaganda on the other by large and
powerful interested parties. Money takes all. Facism is the result. We
are only as good a people as we learn to be. Learning is acquired
through the exchange of information, information from various sources
with varying points of view,
please do not let deep pockets rob us of our country
thank you?

From: IGNATIUS PALMERI
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 2:48 PM
Subject: Broadcast ownership rules

Honorable Persons,

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopoly.

We have just won a victory for freedom in Iraq. Let us not lose a freedom here at home. That freedom is the right to hear varied opinions and not just those of controlling interests. Stand up for Freedom of which so many of us have given their lives. Please protect the broadcast ownership rules.

Respectfully,
Ignatius Palmeri

From: Harris Mithoug
To: Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, Mike Powell, Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 2 55 PM
Subject: re deregulation of the media

To all of who are concerned,

Deregulation of the media is a mistake of major proportions. Not only for the work force which is already suffering immensely under our current administration. But also for the free voice of America and the public interest.

The current administration has done as good of job as any at manipulating the messages that come across in our media, but it won't last. The truth will prevail eventually. Public interest in America is to stand for Freedom. the "very thing we have been fighting for". deregulation takes the freedom from the masses and puts it in the hands of a few who control and take the free press as well as creativity away from an industry that was founded on these concepts. This would be a travesty for the airwaves and the people of America who depend on a free press.

Mr. Powell to you I would ask if you have a copy of the constitution in your office? If you don't you should get one and put it somewhere near. So that you can read it everyday. You say that the FCC hasn't had new policies since the 30's and need updating. Mr. Copps recently made a good point that the constitution is even older. What about the Bible. Not everything that has been written needs to be re-written. If anything the FCC should put the old standards of ownership back in place. Media/Radio has already suffered tremendously due to the new standards for ownership that have taken place just in the last decade.

Don't do this country another injustice. We have suffered enough with lost jobs and lost lives as well as the constant barrages of fear from one threat or another coming from our media. America is a stressed out country!! More people are on anti depressants than ever and many under the age of 30! Isn't it amazing we tell our children "Just Say No" to drugs, yet every other ad on television is another prescription drug that will fix this or that problem. For God's sake what has this tool that we have to reach the people turned into?

As it is it will most likely be a long time before we will gain back even a quarter of the lost jobs in the last few years. Do you want to go down in history as one that helped make things worse for the people of a country that I'm sure you say you love? Deregulation will only cause more lost jobs!

There are too good many reasons not to make this change. I can't think of one good one to deregulate.

But I would have to ask Mr. Powell, would it be personal, perhaps your pocket book. I can't help but be completely skeptical on this issue since any educated man would know this is not a wise move.

Sincerely,
One who cares about our free press
Joey

From: Jillian Bailey
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 2:56 PM
Subject: media consolidation

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a citizen and a consumer, I urge you to hold the line on media consolidation. Our democracy depends upon maintaining a conversation between a wide range of voices. The very fact that few media outlets have covered the issue of media consolidation now before the Commission illustrates what can happen when a few companies, who are no doubt in favor of further consolidation, control a large portion of the media.

Vote no on further media consolidation on June 3.

Jillian Bailey O'Connor
1860 Morton Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90026

From: Barbara Cameron
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 2:59 PM
Subject: broadcast ownership rules

Dear sir

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,
George F. Cameron
Harwich, Massachusetts 02645-2040

CC: Michael Copps, KM JMWWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Lois V
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3 01 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Dear FCC Commissioners,

Please consider the suggested changes for consolidating corporate media to be the last thing we need! This latest experience of the war coverage was a perfect example of how they "all sang the same song" Where was the difference of opinion? Donohue tried it and look what happened to him he was cancelled

We had millions of people marching in protest to the war How much did we see of it or hear their speeches? Very little! No panning of the crowds so we could see the thousands of people in the streets or squares That is when I turned off the U S "news" It no longer became news but simple propaganda I am old enough to remember WW II and I do remember propaganda We were fed only what they wanted us to know "to keep up our spirits" Why are the media and the government so afraid to let the truth be known? It is not only what they tell us but also what the media decides (for themselves) what not to tell us Thanks goodness I have satellite because I am able to watch the "real news" from Canada and/or Europe

If you pass this new action to allow even more consolidation of the media the consequence will be that more and more we will learn less and less of the truth of what is going on in the world and/or this country Everything that is given in the media will then be given with one voice Is that your real aim?

Lois E. Vesely
Corvallis, Oregon

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, adelste@fcc.gov

From: itzam
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3:03 PM
Subject: No further consolidation of media ownership

Mr. Copps,

Please, please, for the sake of our democratic principles, do not allow continued consolidation of media ownership. There are obvious reasons why regulations limiting media ownership were created. You must know the history. The homogenous news reporting on major media outlets is frightening. Currently I have to look to media sources outside of the USA to get complete and unbiased news. Most Americans get a very narrow view of world events. Please don't make the situation any worse. Thank you.

From: Meerabai@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3:09 PM
Subject: June 2 vote

I AM VEHEMENTLY OPPOSED TO THE PROPOSED DE-REGULATION OF THE 1934 LAW. I HOPE YOU WILL LISTEN TO THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE.

JOAN JACOBS
CENTERVILLE, TN

From: ALLARDW@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3:15 PM
Subject: taking points

Dear Ms. Abernathy,

I urge you NOT to relax the broadcast rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and TV news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

William J. Allard
Bayville, NY 11709

From: Arun K Gopal
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3:17 PM
Subject: FCC rulings regarding deregulation

Dear Commissioner Copps,
mcopps@fcc.gov

Please let this letter serve as my formal complaint and objection to any pending FCC rulings which may lift restrictions on mergers between TV broadcast networks and the number of local TV or radio stations owned by one company. Such deregulation threatens to further stifle the diversity of programming for consumers, advertisers and producers. One of the main charges of the FCC is to promote diversity, which doesn't just refer to people of color, it refers to many different types of programming. We applaud you, Commissioner Copps, for attempting to draw attention to this problem. I would like to go on record as being opposed to increased or further media deregulation and wish for you to act on my behalf and STOP further media deregulation.

Respectfully yours,
Arun Gopal
Second Year Medical Student
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

From: Barbara Cameron
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3:17 PM
Subject: Broadcast ownership rules

Dear Madam,

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedoms, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,
George F. Cameron
Harwich, Massachusetts 02645-2040

From: S Campbell
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3 22 PM
Subject: Don't Consolidate Ownership of Broadcast Channels

Dear Sir,
Please do not make it easier for fewer companies to control more of the
broadcast channels we recieve on our TV and radio
In our democratic country it is your responsibility to give us access to a
diveristy of editorial opinions

Thank you very much for your help in this extremely important issue
Sincerely,
Stephen M Campbell

From: kathy sanders
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3:36 PM
Subject: 35% ownership vote

Dear Commissioner,

The vote you are about to take in June to allow more than 35% ownership of media outlets requires more research and public input. The impact of one corporation having such a larger control over the media in one market will be serious and long term and will affect the ability of democracy to function fairly.

Please do not allow such a vote until more members of the public have time to assess this decision's impact. Intuitively, I can only see that an affirmative vote will be detrimental for American's ability to see that total picture on an issue, or to know that an important issue, such as this one, is about to take place.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Sanders
310 Redwood Rd
San Anselmo, CA

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster Easier Bingo

CC: Kathleen Abernathy